



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,129	11/25/2003	Cara L. Iddings	IGT1P317/AC00042-002	9452
79646 7590 11/12/2010 Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP - IGT Attn: IGT P.O. Box 70250 Oakland, CA 94612-0250				
			EXAMINER SHRESTHA, BLENDRA K	
			ART UNIT 3691	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/12/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@wavsip.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/723,129

Applicant(s)

IDDINGS, CARA L.

Examiner

BIJENDRA K. SHRESTHA

Art Unit

3691

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19-23 and 25-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19-23 and 25-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-17, 19-23 and 25-41 are presented for examination. Applicant filed an amendment on 08/27/2010 amending claims 1, 8, 9, 22, 37 and 40. After careful consideration of applicant's amendments and arguments, new ground of rejections of claims has been established in the instant application as set forth in detail below. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Intended Use Language Recitations

The amended claims 1, 8, 9, 22 and 40 included intended use language recitation such as "thereby" or "for the purpose of electronically corroborating the amount of jackpot value...". These intended use limitations do not carry any patentable weight.

Examiner notes that the fact that these elements are capable of performing specific functions does not mean that they actually perform the functions as recited in the claims. The functions recited in the claim are not positive limitations but only requires the elements to be able to perform the functions. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See MPEP 2114 and *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made

2. Claims 1-17, 18-21, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hilgendorf et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,249,800 (reference A in attached PTO-892) in view of Solomon, U.S. Patent No. 6,892,938 (reference B in attached PTO-892) further in view of Mothwurf et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,712,695 (reference C in attached PTO-892) and Walter et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,300,349 (reference D in attached PTO-892).

3. As per claims 1 and 2, Hilgendorf et al. teach a method for electronically corroborating and authorizing a manual payment of a gaming jackpot (see column 1, lines 43-54), comprising:

receiving a jackpot winning signal from a gaming machine, said jackpot signal including *an amount of* a jackpot value of a jackpot won by a player (see Fig. 1, column 3, lines 33-37; where communication unit 26 receives jackpot hit data message from one of the gaming machine 10 and ASCII "0-7" to indicate which of jackpot listed in Table 16 has been hit; column 6, lines 58-68).

authorizing transfer of the confirmed jackpot value to the player without a requirement for a human corroborating payment witnessing user (see column 3, lines

11-12; where jackpot is paid through hopper without requirement of a human witness);
and

Hilgendorf et al. do not teach receiving a payment user transaction signal, said transaction signal including a payment user identifier and a jackpot transaction value inputted by a payment attendant, the payment user identifier identifying the payment attendant and the jackpot transaction value indicating an amount of a jackpot won by the player.

Solomon teaches receiving a payment user transaction signal, said transaction signal including a payment user identifier and a jackpot transaction value inputted by a payment attendant, the payment user identifier identifying the payment attendant and the jackpot transaction value indicating an amount of a jackpot won by the player (Solomon, Fig. 1 and 4, column 4, lines 1-49; where attendant identifies itself to gaming machine and process payments based on list of assigned payment to attendant by the computer).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receiving a payment user transaction signal, said transaction signal including a payment user identifier and a jackpot transaction value inputted by a payment attendant and the jackpot transaction value indicating an amount of a jackpot won by the player of Hilgendorf et al. because the Solomon teaches including above features would enable to meet governmental reporting requirements for casino for reducing fraud and theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 4-6).

Hilgendorf et al. do not teach receiving payment user transaction signal via jackpot server.

Mothwurf et al. teach receiving winning signal from gaming machine and payment user transaction signal via jackpot server (Mothwurf et al., abstract; column 3, lines 7-33)

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate receiving winning signal from gaming machine and payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server of Hilgendorf et al. because Mothwurf et al. teach including above features would enable the management of casino to flexibly configure the jackpot maximizing profit and turnover (Mothwurf et al., column 2, lines 24-29).

Hilgendorf et al. do not teach comparing the amount of the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal to the amount of the jackpot transaction value of the payment user transaction signal **inputted by the payment attendant** and generating a confirmed jackpot value if the *amount of the* jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal is equal to the jackpot transaction value of the payment user transaction signal and creating a record of the authorized transfer, thereby electronically corroborating the amount of the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal.

Walker et al. teach comparing the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal to the jackpot transaction value of the payment user transaction signal **inputted by the payment attendant** and generating a confirmed jackpot value if the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal is equal to the jackpot transaction value of the payment user

transaction signal, creating a record of the authorized transfer and authorizing transfer of the confirmed jackpot value to the player without a requirement for a human corroborating payment witnessing user (see Fig. 14; column 14, lines 48-59; where the operator verifies the payout amount with the server with inputting identified winning lottery ticket containing ticket identifier, Dealer Identifier and Prize Amount (see Figs. 4-7) into ticket reader, lottery server confirms the payout amount by transmitting back the payout amount, operator /attendant makes payment the winner *without presence of a witness* and a payment receipt is printed as record).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate comparing the amount of the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal to the *amount of the* jackpot transaction value of the payment user transaction signal ***inputted by the payment attendant*** and generating a confirmed jackpot value if the *amount of the* jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal is equal to the jackpot transaction value of the payment user transaction signal and creating a record of the authorized transfer, thereby electronically corroborating the amount of the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal of Hilgendorf et al. because Walter et al. teach including above features would enable to centralize lottery receiving and processing operations but lottery themselves being themselves being sold at remote authorized outlets or terminals (Walter et al., column 1, lines 37-41).

4. As per claims 3-5, Hilgendorf et al. in view of Solomon further in view of Mothwurf et al. teach claim 1 as described above. Hilgendorf et al. further teach the method of comprising:

suspending said gaming machine to prevent further gaming play thereon; transferring the confirmed jackpot value to the player; and releasing the gaming machine to permit gaming play thereon (see Fig. 2; column 4, lines 50-63; where machines are locked until jackpot is paid).

5. As per claims 6-7, Hilgendorf et al. in view of Solomon further in view of Mothwurf et al. teach claim 1 as described above.

Hilgendorf et al. do not teach generating an unconfirmed jackpot value signal if the amount of the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal is not equal to the amount of the jackpot transaction value of the transaction signal; generating a witness summoning signal; comparing the amount of the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal to a maximum jackpot witness-less manual payment value; and requiring a corroborating payment witnessing user if the amount of the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal is greater than a witness-less jackpot manual payment maximum value.

Solomon teaches generating an unconfirmed jackpot value signal if the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal is not equal to the jackpot transaction value of the transaction signal; generating a witness summoning signal; comparing the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal to a maximum jackpot witness-less manual payment value; and requiring a corroborating payment witnessing user if the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal is greater than a witness-less jackpot manual payment maximum value (Solomon, column 1, lines 16-55; column 6, lines 28-45; where employee pays jackpot without witness such as through cash dispensing peripheral for predetermined amount; additional authorization or witness is required for payment over predetermined value).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate generating an unconfirmed jackpot value signal if the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal is not equal to the jackpot transaction value of the transaction signal; generating a witness summoning signal; comparing the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal to a maximum jackpot witness-less manual payment value; and requiring a corroborating payment witnessing user if the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal is greater than a witness-less jackpot manual payment maximum value of Hilgendorf et al. in view of Mothwurf et al. because Solomon teaches including above features would enable to reduce the threat of fraud or theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 6-9).

6. As per claim 8, Hilgendorf et al. teach an article comprising a storage medium, said storage medium having stored thereon instructions that, when executed by a computing device (see Fig. 2, MPU (40)):

receiving a jackpot winning signal from a gaming machine, said jackpot signal including *an amount of* a jackpot value of a jackpot won by a player (see Fig. 1, column 3, lines 33-37; where communication unit 26 receives jackpot hit data message from one of the gaming machine 10 and ASCII "0-7" to indicate which of jackpot listed in Table 16 has been hit);

authorizing transfer of the confirmed jackpot value to the player without a requirement for a human corroborating payment witnessing user (see column 3, lines

11-12; where jackpot is paid through hopper without requirement of a human witness);
and

Hilgendorf et al. do not teach receiving a payment user transaction signal, said transaction signal including a payment user identifier and a jackpot transaction value inputted by a payment attendant, the payment user identifier identifying the payment attendant and the jackpot transaction value indicating an amount of a jackpot won by the player.

Solomon teaches receiving a payment user transaction signal, said transaction signal including a payment user identifier and a jackpot transaction value inputted by a payment attendant, the payment user identifier identifying the payment attendant and the jackpot transaction value indicating an amount of a jackpot won by the player (Solomon, Fig. 1 and 4, column 4, lines 1-49; where attendant identifies itself to gaming machine and process payments based on list of assigned payment to attendant by the computer)

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receiving a payment user transaction signal, said transaction signal including a payment user identifier and a jackpot transaction value inputted by a payment attendant and the jackpot transaction value indicating an amount of a jackpot won by the player of Hilgendorf et al. because the Solomon teaches including above features would enable to meet governmental reporting requirements for casino for reducing fraud and theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 4-6).

Hilgendorf et al. do not teach payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server.

Mothwurf et al. teach receiving winning signal from gaming machine and payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server (Mothwurf et al., abstract)

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate receiving winning signal from gaming machine and payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server of Hilgendorf et al. because Mothwurf et al. teach including above features would enable the management of casino to flexibly configure the jackpot maximizing profit and turnover (Mothwurf et al., column 2, lines 24-29).

Hilgendorf et al. do not teach comparing the amount of the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal to the amount of the jackpot transaction value of the payment user transaction signal **inputted by the payment attendant** and generating a confirmed jackpot value if the *amount of the* jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal is equal to the jackpot transaction value of the payment user transaction signal and creating a record of the authorized transfer, thereby electronically corroborating the amount of the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal.

Walker et al. teach comparing the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal to the jackpot transaction value of the payment user transaction signal **inputted by the payment attendant** and generating a confirmed jackpot value if the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal is equal to the jackpot transaction value of the payment user transaction signal, creating a record of the authorized transfer and authorizing transfer of the confirmed jackpot value to the player without a requirement for a human corroborating payment witnessing user (see Fig. 14; column 14, lines 48-59; where the

operator verifies the payout amount with the server with inputting identified winning lottery ticket containing ticket identifier, Dealer Identifier and Prize Amount (see Figs. 4-7) into ticket reader, lottery server confirms the payout amount by transmitting back the payout amount and operator /attendant makes payment the winner *without presence of a witness* and a payment receipt is printed as a record).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate comparing the amount of the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal to the *amount of the* jackpot transaction value of the payment user transaction signal ***inputted by the payment attendant*** and generating a confirmed jackpot value if the *amount of the* jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal is equal to the jackpot transaction value of the payment user transaction signal and creating a record of the authorized transfer, thereby electronically corroborating the amount of the jackpot value of the jackpot winning signal of Hilgendorf et al. because Walter et al. teach including above features would enable to centralize lottery receiving and processing operations but lottery themselves being themselves being sold at remote authorized outlets or terminals (Walter et al., column 1, lines 37-41).

7. As per claim 9 and 10, Hilgendorf et al. teach a method for corroborating a gaming machine jackpot payment, comprising:

generating a jackpot winning signal corresponding to a jackpot won by a player of a gaming machine, said jackpot winning signal including a jackpot value (see Fig. 1, column 3, lines 33-37; where communication unit 26 receives jackpot hit data message

from one of the gaming machine 10 and ASCII "0-7" to indicate which of jackpot listed in Table 16 has been hit);

authorizing the jackpot payment user to credit the jackpot value to the winning player without a human jackpot payment corroborating witness (see column 3, lines 11-12; where jackpot is paid through hopper without requirement of a human witness; Examiner notes that it is requirement set by governmental reporting requirement that jackpot payment in excess of certain amount (for example, \$100.00) must be witnessed (see column 3, page 36, Jackpot Payout and Slot Fills (reference U in attached PTO - 892)); .

Hilgendorf et al. do not teach determining a jackpot payment user authorization, including identifying a jackpot payment user and determining if the jackpot payment user is authorized to transfer the jackpot value to the winning player; comparing the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal to a jackpot manual witness payment value at a jackpot server; declining to authorize the jackpot payment user to credit the jackpot value to the winning player if the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal is greater than the jackpot manual witness payment value.

Solomon teaches determining a jackpot payment user authorization, including identifying a jackpot payment user and determining if the jackpot payment user is authorized to transfer the jackpot value to the winning player (Solomon, Fig. 1 and 4, column 4, lines 1-49; where attendant identifies itself to gaming machine and process payments based on list of assigned payment to attendant by the computer); comparing the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal to a jackpot manual witness payment

value at a jackpot server; declining to authorize the jackpot payment user to credit the jackpot value to the winning player if the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal is greater than the jackpot manual witness payment value (Solomon, column 1, lines 17-24).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate determining a jackpot payment user authorization, including identifying a jackpot payment user and determining if the jackpot payment user is authorized to transfer the jackpot value to the winning player; comparing the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal to a jackpot manual witness payment value at a jackpot server; declining to authorize the jackpot payment user to credit the jackpot value to the winning player if the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal is greater than the jackpot manual witness payment value of Hilgendorf et al. because Solomon teaches including above features would enable to meet governmental reporting requirements for casino for reducing fraud and theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 4-6).

Hilgendorf et al. do not teach payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing this value to generate jackpot value.

Mothwurf et al. teach receiving winning signal from gaming machine and payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing this value to generate jackpot value (Mothwurf et al., abstract)

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate receiving winning signal from gaming machine and payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing these value to

generate jackpot value of Hilgendorf et al. because Mothwurf et al. teach including above features would enable the management of casino to flexibly configure the jackpot maximizing profit and turnover (Mothwurf et al., column 2, lines 24-29).

Hilgendorf et al. do not teach verifying the jackpot value if the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal is equal to the jackpot manual witness payment value and printing a jackpot payment transaction receipt including indicia indicating that authorization was granted without the requirement for a corroborating payment witnessing user.

Walker et al. teach verifying the jackpot value if the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal is equal to the jackpot manual witness payment value and printing a jackpot payment transaction receipt including indicia indicating that authorization was granted without the requirement for a corroborating payment witnessing user (Walker et al., Fig. 14).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include verifying the jackpot value if the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal is equal to the jackpot manual witness payment value and printing a jackpot payment transaction receipt including indicia indicating that authorization was granted without the requirement for a corroborating payment witnessing user of Hilgendorf et al. because Walter et al. teach including above features would enable to centralize lottery receiving and processing operations (Walter et al., column 1, lines 37-41).

8. As per claim 11, Hilgendorf et al. in view of Solomon further in view of Mothwurf et al. teach claim 9 as described above. Hilgendorf et al. further teach the method wherein

the jackpot winning signal includes at least one of chronological data or a gaming machine identifier (see Fig; Gaming machine (2-5); column 6, lines 63-65; where signal is conveyed to identify gaming machine).

9. As per claim 12-13, Hilgendorf et al. in view of Solomon further in view of Mothwurf et al. teach claim 9 as described above.

Hilgendorf et al. teach credit the jackpot value to the winning player without a jackpot payment corroborating witness (see column 7, lines 25-31).

Hilgendorf et al. does not teach determining a jackpot payment user authorization comprises determining a jackpot manual payment permission of the jackpot payment user; comparing a jackpot payment user identification code entered at the gaming machine to a stored jackpot payment user identification code; and authorizing the jackpot payment user to credit the jackpot value to the winning player.

Solomon teaches determining a jackpot payment user authorization comprises determining a jackpot manual payment permission of the jackpot payment user; comparing a jackpot payment user identification code entered at the gaming machine to a stored jackpot payment user identification code; and authorizing the jackpot payment user to credit the jackpot value to the winning player (Solomon, column 2, lines 15-23; column 7, lines 39-42).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate determining a jackpot payment user authorization comprises determining a jackpot manual payment permission of the jackpot payment user; comparing a jackpot payment user identification code entered at the gaming machine to a stored jackpot payment user identification code; and authorizing the jackpot payment user to credit the jackpot value to the winning player of Hilgendorf et al. in view of Mothwurf et al. because Solomon teaches including above features would enable to reduce the threat of fraud or theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 6-9).

10. As per claims 14-15, Hilgendorf et al. in view of Solomon further in view of Mothwurf et al. teach claim 9 as described above.

Hilgendorf et al. does not teach determining a jackpot payment user authorization comprises generating a jackpot manual payment permission request for the jackpot payment user if said jackpot payment user does not have an associated jackpot manual payment permission; and logging the jackpot manual payment permission request.

Solomon teaches assigning the jackpot payment transaction to employees of casino and storing biometric characteristics of the employee (Solomon, Fig. 4, step 52; Fig. 2, steps 62, 64; column 5, lines 33-54; Examiner interprets assignment of payment transaction involves processing request for new permission).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate determining a jackpot payment user authorization comprises generating a jackpot manual payment permission request for the jackpot payment user if said jackpot payment user does not have an associated jackpot manual

payment permission; and logging the jackpot manual payment permission request of Hilgendorf et al. in view of Mothwurf et al. because Solomon teaches including above features would enable to reduce the threat of fraud or theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 6-9).

11. As per claims 16-17, Hilgendorf et al. in view of Solomon further in view of Mothwurf et al. teach claim 9 as described above. Hilgendorf et al. further teach the method of claim 9, further comprising:

crediting the jackpot value to the winning player; dispensing to the winning player cash equal to the jackpot value, dispensing to the winning player a check in the amount of the jackpot value (see column 3, lines 53-56).

Hilgendorf et al. does not teach assigning a credit equal to the jackpot value to the credit meter of the gaming machine, or assigning a credit equal to the jackpot value to an account of the winning player.

Solomon teaches assigning a credit equal to the jackpot value to the credit meter of the gaming machine, or assigning a credit equal to the jackpot value to an account of the winning player (Solomon, column 3, lines 42-44).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate assigning a credit equal to the jackpot value to the credit meter of the gaming machine, or assigning a credit equal to the jackpot value to an account of the winning player t of Hilgendorf et al. in view of Mothwurf et al. because including above features would enable to reduce the gaming machine operating costs.

12. As per claim 19, Hilgendorf et al. in view of Solomon further in view of Mothwurf et al. teach claim 9 as described above.

Hilgendorf et al. does not teach the method wherein the jackpot manual witness payment value is a selectable value.

Solomon teaches the method wherein the jackpot manual witness payment value is a selectable value (see column 3, lines 44-50).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the jackpot manual witness payment value is a selectable value of Hilgendorf et al. in view of Mothwurf et al. because Solomon teaches including above features would enable to meet the governmental reporting requirements for casino to reduce fraud and theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 4-6).

13. As per claim 20-21, Hilgendorf et al. in view of Solomon further in view of Mothwurf et al. teach claim 9 as described above.

Hilgendorf et al. does not teach the method comprising storing parameters of the jackpot value credit authorization in a jackpot payment database; and parameters of the jackpot value credit authorization include at least one of the jackpot value, a gaming machine identifier, gaming machine chronological data, and a jackpot payment user identifier.

Solomon teaches storing parameters of the jackpot value credit authorization in a jackpot payment database; and parameters of the jackpot value credit authorization include at least one of the jackpot value, a gaming machine identifier, gaming machine

chronological data, and a jackpot payment user identifier (Solomon, column 2, lines 18-23, 30-36).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate storing parameters of the jackpot value credit authorization in a jackpot payment database; and parameters of the jackpot value credit authorization include at least one of the jackpot value, a gaming machine identifier, gaming machine chronological data, and a jackpot payment user identifier of Hilgendorf et al. in view of Mothwurf et al. because Solomon teaches including above features would enable to reduce the threat of fraud and theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 6-9).

14. As per claim 40, Hilgendorf et al. teach a method for corroborating a gaming machine jackpot payment, comprising:

receiving a jackpot signal from the gaming machine via a jackpot sever, said jackpot signal corresponding to a jackpot won by a player of a gaming machine and including a jackpot value (see Fig. 1, column 3, lines 33-37; where communication unit 26 receives jackpot hit data message from one of the gaming machine 10 and ASCII "0-7" to indicate which of jackpot listed in Table 16 has been hit);

authorizing the jackpot payment attendant to pay the jackpot value to the winning player at the gaming machine without a human jackpot payment corroborating witness if the jackpot value and the jackpot payment value are equal; paying the jackpot value to the winning player (see column 3, lines 11-12; where jackpot is paid through hopper without requirement of a human witness; Examiner notes that it is requirement

set by governmental reporting requirement that jackpot payment in excess of certain amount (for example, \$100.00) must be witnessed (see Mills, J.R.(reference U in attached PTO -892)); and

storing parameters of the jackpot value payment in a jackpot payment database (see Fig. 2; Communication Unit (26); column 2, lines 18-38; where communication unit stores jackpot values such as "Royal Flush", "Straight Flush" and so on and communicates to gaming machines).

Hilgendorf et al. do not teach receiving a jackpot payment request via the jackpot server initiated by a jackpot payment attendant, said jackpot payment request including a user identification signal and a jackpot payment value inputted by a payment attendant, the payment user identifier identifying the payment attendant.

Solomon teaches receiving a jackpot payment request at the jackpot server initiated by a jackpot payment attendant, said jackpot payment request including a user identification signal and a jackpot payment value inputted by a payment attendant, the payment user identifier identifying the payment attendant (Solomon, Fig. 1 and 4, column 4, lines 1-49; where attendant identifies itself to gaming machine and process payments based on list of assigned payment to attendant by the computer).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receiving a payment user transaction signal, said transaction signal including a payment user identifier and a jackpot transaction value inputted by a payment attendant of Hilgendorf et al. because Solomon teaches including above

features would enable to meet governmental reporting requirements for casino for reducing fraud and theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 4-6).

Hilgendorf et al. do not determining a jackpot payment authorization for the jackpot payment (attendant); comparing the jackpot value and the jackpot payment value.

Walker et al. teach determining a jackpot payment authorization for the jackpot payment (attendant); comparing the jackpot value and the jackpot payment value *inputted by the payment attendant* via the jackpot server for the purpose of electronically corroborating the amount of the jackpot value (see Fig. 14; column 14, lines 48-59; where the operator verifies the payout amount with the server with inputting identified winning lottery ticket containing ticket identifier, Dealer Identifier and Prize Amount (see Figs. 4-7) into ticket reader, lottery server confirms the payout amount by transmitting back the payout amount and operator /attendant makes payment to the winner *without presence of a witness*).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate determining a jackpot payment authorization for the jackpot payment (attendant); comparing the jackpot value and the jackpot payment value inputted by the payment attendant via the jackpot server for the purpose of electronically corroborating the amount of the jackpot value of Hilgendorf et al. because Walter et al. teach including above features would enable to centralize lottery receiving and processing operations but lottery themselves being themselves being sold at remote authorized outlets or terminals (Walter et al., column 1, lines 37-41).

Hilgendorf et al. do not teach receiving payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server.

Mothwurf et al. teach receiving winning signal from gaming machine and payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing these value to generate jackpot value at the jackpot server (Mothwurf et al., abstract)

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate receiving winning signal from gaming machine and payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server and comparing these value to generate jackpot value of Hilgendorf et al. because Mothwurf et al. teach including above features would enable the management of casino to flexibly configure the jackpot maximizing profit and turnover (Mothwurf et al., column 2, lines 24-29).

15. As per claim 41, Hilgendorf et al. in view of Solomon further in view of Mothwurf et al. teach claim 40 as described above.

Hilgendorf et al. does not teach the method comprising receiving a jackpot reimbursement request from a jackpot payment attendant at a value station remote from the gaming machine, said transaction reimbursement request including the user identification signal; comparing the user identification signal of the jackpot reimbursement request with the user identification signal of the jackpot transaction request; authorizing a reimbursement of the jackpot value to the jackpot payment attendant if the user identification signals match; and printing a jackpot transaction record indicating authorization of a transfer of the jackpot value without a human jackpot payment corroborating witness.

Solomon teaches the method comprising receiving a jackpot reimbursement request from a jackpot payment attendant at a value station remote from the gaming machine, said transaction reimbursement request including the user identification signal; comparing the user identification signal of the jackpot reimbursement request with the user identification signal of the jackpot transaction request; authorizing a reimbursement of the jackpot value to the jackpot payment attendant if the user identification signals match (Solomon, abstract).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method comprising receiving a jackpot reimbursement request from a jackpot payment attendant at a value station remote from the gaming machine, said transaction reimbursement request including the user identification signal; comparing the user identification signal of the jackpot reimbursement request with the user identification signal of the jackpot transaction request; authorizing a reimbursement of the jackpot value to the jackpot payment attendant if the user identification signals match; of Hilgendorf et al. in view of Mothwurf et al. because Solomon teaches including above features would enable to reduce the threat of fraud or theft (Solomon, column 2, lines 6-9).

Solomon does not teach printing a jackpot transaction record indicating authorization of a transfer of the jackpot value without a human jackpot payment corroborating witness.

Walker et al. teach printing a jackpot payment transaction receipt including indicia that a human jackpot payment corroborating witness is not required for transfer of verified jackpot value (Walker et al., Fig. 14, step 298; column 14, lines 54-55).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include printing a jackpot payment transaction receipt authorization of a transfer of the jackpot value without a human jackpot payment corroborating witness of Hilgendorf et al. because Walter et al. teach including above features would enable to centralize lottery receiving and processing operations (Walter et al., column 1, lines 37-41).

16. Claims 22-23 and 25-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Solomon, U.S Patent No. 6,892,938 (reference C in attached PTO-892) in view of Mothwurf et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,712,695 (reference B in attached PTO-892) further in view of Walter et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,300,349 (reference D in attached PTO-892).

17. As per claim 22, Solomon teaches a method for electronically corroborating and paying a gaming machine jackpot, comprising:

generating a jackpot payment transaction request by a jackpot payment user, jackpot payment transaction request including a jackpot payment user identifier and a jackpot payment request value wherein the jackpot payment user identifier identifies the jackpot payment user (see Fig. 2; column 2, lines 53-67; where employee

or payment user request payment transaction approval by listing transaction and identifying him/her using biometric sensor);

authorizing at the jackpot server a transfer without a human jackpot payment corroborating witness of a verified jackpot value to a player of said gaming machine (see column 1, lines 16-24; column 6, lines 34-41; where cash payment is made at cash dispensing peripheral without corroborating witness).

Solomon does not teach verifying at a jackpot server the jackpot payment request value with a jackpot signal value of a jackpot signal transmitted from a gaming machine.

Mothwurf et al. teach verifying at a jackpot server the jackpot payment request value with a jackpot signal value of a jackpot signal transmitted from a gaming machine (Mothwurf et al., abstract)

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate verifying at a jackpot server the jackpot payment request value with a jackpot signal value of a jackpot signal transmitted from a gaming machine of Solomon because Mothwurf et al. teach including above features would enable the management of casino to flexibly configure the jackpot maximizing profit and turnover (Mothwurf et al., column 2, lines 24-29).

Solomon does not teach printing a jackpot payment transaction receipt including indicia that a human jackpot payment corroborating witness is not required for transfer of verified jackpot value.

Walker et al. teach printing a jackpot payment transaction receipt including indicia that a human jackpot payment corroborating witness is not required for transfer of verified jackpot value (Walker et al., Fig. 14, step 298; column 14, lines 54-55).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include printing a jackpot payment transaction receipt including indicia that a human jackpot payment corroborating witness is not required for transfer of verified jackpot value of Hilgendorf et al. because Walter et al. teach including above features would enable to centralize lottery receiving and processing operations (Walter et al., column 1, lines 37-41).

18. As per claim 23, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 22 as described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein

the jackpot signal further includes **at least one of** a gaming player identity value, a gaming machine identity value, a chronological value, or gaming outcome data (see column 7, lines 56-58).

19. As per claim 25, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 22 as described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein verifying the jackpot value comprises:

comparing the jackpot value of the jackpot signal to a maximum jackpot witness-less manual payment value; and requiring a jackpot payment corroborating witness if the jackpot value of the jackpot signal is greater than the maximum jackpot witness-less manual payment value (see Fig. 4; column 1, lines 16-24; column 27-45;

where funds are paid at jackpot fill station using cash dispensing peripheral without witness for predetermined amount).

20. As per claim 26, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 22 as described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein

the maximum jackpot witness-less manual payment value is a selectable value (see Fig. 4; column 1, lines 16-24; column 6, lines 40-45).

21. As per claim 27, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 22 as described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein verifying the jackpot value comprises:

comparing the jackpot payment request value of the jackpot payment transaction request to a maximum jackpot witness-less manual payment value; and requiring a jackpot payment corroborating witness if the jackpot payment request value is greater than the maximum jackpot witness-less manual payment value; else authorizing the jackpot payment transaction request without a payment corroborating witness requirement (see Fig. 4: column 1, lines 16-24; column 6, lines 28-45).

22. As per claim 28, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 27 as described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein

the maximum jackpot witness-less manual payment value is a selectable value (see column 1, lines 16-24; column 6, lines 28-41; where witness-less manual payment of jackpot is for predetermined value).

23. As per claim 29-30, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 22 as described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein

verifying the jackpot value comprises correlating the jackpot signal value with the jackpot payment request value; and rejecting the jackpot payment transaction request if the jackpot signal value is not equal to the jackpot payment request value; and storing the jackpot payment transaction request rejection (see column 1, lines 16-24; column 7, lines 39-42; where if the jackpot payment amount over predetermined amount is rejected unless authorization another employee or cashier is obtained).

24. As per claim 31, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 30 as described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein transferring the jackpot value comprises

crediting the jackpot value to a player account (see column 3, lines 42-47; where jackpot payment is credited).

25. As per claim 32, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 22 as described above. Solomon further teaches the method comprising:

transferring the jackpot value from the jackpot payment user to the gaming player of said gaming machine (see column 3, lines 43-47; where jackpot payment is made to gaming player by hand pay, hopper fills or credits).

26. As per claim 33, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 32 as described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein transferring the jackpot value to a player comprises

physically transferring a tangible value medium from the jackpot payment user to the player (see column 6, lines 33-36; where payment user or employee physically takes printed ticket to cashier to pay the gaming player).

27. As per claim 34, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 22 as described above. Solomon further teaches the method comprising:

storing jackpot value transfer data in a jackpot payment data log (see column 3, lines 44; where examiner interprets crediting the gaming player jackpot payment involves storing jackpot transfer data).

28. As per claim 35, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 34 as described above. Solomon further teaches the method of storing jackpot value transfer data comprises

storing data representing at least one of the jackpot signal or the jackpot payment transaction request (see Fig. 2; column 2, lines 53-67; where employee or payment user request payment transaction approval by listing transaction and identifying him/her using biometric sensor).

29. As per claim 36, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 22 as described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein authorizing a jackpot value transfer comprises:

determining if the jackpot payment user has an associated jackpot manual payment permission; approving the jackpot payment transaction request if the jackpot payment user has an associated jackpot manual payment permission (see column 5, lines 1-6; manual payment of jackpot is permitted after matching sensed biometric characteristics to stored characteristics of the employee making manual payment); and

assigning a jackpot value transfer authorization code (see column 1, lines 48-52; column 5, lines 7-17; where computer 38 print out ticket after matching the biometric

characteristics of the employee signifying the authorization of the manual payment to jackpot winner).

30. As per claim 37, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 36 as described above. Solomon further teaches the method wherein:

storing jackpot value transfer data comprises storing the jackpot payment transaction request and the jackpot value transfer authorization code (see column 1, lines 48-52; column 3, lines 44; where examiner interprets crediting the gaming player jackpot payment involves storing jackpot transfer data which includes jackpot payment transaction request and the jackpot value transfer authorization code).

31. As per claim 38-39, Solomon in view of Mothwurf et al. teaches claim 36 as described above. Solomon further teaches the method comprising:

rejecting the jackpot payment transaction request if the jackpot payment user does not have an associated jackpot manual payment permission; comparing the jackpot payment request value to a jackpot payment value limit associated with the jackpot payment user; approving the jackpot payment transaction request if the jackpot payment request value is equal to or less than the jackpot payment value limit; and rejecting the jackpot payment transaction request if the jackpot payment request value is greater than the jackpot payment value limit (see column 1, lines 16-24; column 7, lines 39-48; where if amount of jackpot payment to be made by an employee is over predetermined amount, additional authorization by another employee is required).

Response to Arguments

32. After careful consideration of applicant's amendments and arguments, new ground of rejections of claims has been established in the instant application. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Nonobviousness cannot be established by attacking the references individually, when the rejection is predicated upon a combination of prior art disclosures. See *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 1097 (Fed. Cir.1986). The applicant has attacked the references individually, when rejection was made using a combination of Hilgendorf, Solomon, Walker and Mothwurf. The claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Additionally, it is noted that KSR forecloses the argument that a **specific** teaching, suggestion, or motivation is required to support a finding of obviousness. Under KSR, a claim would have been obvious if the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention (Rationale A). Furthermore, under KSR, a claim would have been obvious if a particular known technique was recognized as part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

capable of applying the teachings of Boyd and Ovadia into the disclosure of Pentel and the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art (Rationale D).

Walker et al. teach the operator or attendant verifies the payout amount with the server by inputting identified winning lottery ticket containing ticket identifier, Dealer Identifier and Prize Amount (see Figs. 4-7) into ticket reader and lottery server confirms the payout amount by transmitting back the payout amount and operator/attendant prints receipt and makes payment to the winner *without presence of a witness* (see Fig. 14; column 14, lines 48-59). Solomon teaches determining a jackpot payment user authorization, including identifying a jackpot payment user and determining if the jackpot payment user is authorized to transfer the jackpot value to the winning player (Solomon, Fig. 1 and 4, column 4, lines 1-49; where attendant identifies itself to gaming machine and process payments based on list of assigned payment to attendant by the computer); comparing the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal to a jackpot manual witness payment value at a jackpot server; declining to authorize the jackpot payment user to credit the jackpot value to the winning player if the jackpot value of said jackpot winning signal is greater than the jackpot manual witness payment value (Solomon, column 1, lines 17-24).

Examiner respectively disagrees that features "receiving winning signal from gaming machine and payment user transaction signal at a jackpot server" not taught by Mothwurf et al. Mothwurf et al. teach "a jackpot system for the allocation of wins from at least one jackpot to players... centralized ..computing engine... win determination unit

.. to generate a result.. a comparator for comparing the result and initiating transfer of win.. (Mothwurf et al., column 3, lines 7-32).

Conclusion

33. Accordingly, this is made **Non-Final**. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosures. The following are pertinent to current invention, though not relied upon:

Hilgendorf et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,249,800) teach progressive gaming control and communication system.

Nguyen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,984,175) teach electronic payout administration method and system for gaming apparatus.

Nguyen et al. (U.S. Pub No. 2003/0162591) teach player authentication for cashless gaming machine instruments.

Orus et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,580,310) teach games machine with mechanical counters a laid down by regulations, and with electronic payment mechanism.

Prasad et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,152) teach method of protecting transaction information using transaction signature.

Stanek (U.S. Pub No. 2003/0069059) teaches lotto game having jackpot prize level.

Stern (U.S. Patent No. 6,110,044) teaches method and apparatus for issuing and automatically validating gaming machine payout tickets.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bijendra K. Shrestha whose telephone number is (571)270-1374. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-4:30PM (Monday-Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571)272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bijendra K. Shrestha/
Examiner, Art Unit 3691
11/02/2010

